



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

OPEN LETTERS.

"Nature of the binary name," again.

Professor Greene does me an unmerited honor in discussing so fully my humble suggestion respecting the nature of the binary name. I asked if the name of a plant is one word or two. Professor Greene's reply is most ingenious and one which, I must admit, had never occurred to me. His chief reply is in the form of a suppositious case. He supposes that I could lecture for an hour or more on *Carex*, and mention any number of species, and yet not even once use the word *Carex*; therefore, the specific name is, in that case, *the name* of the plant. Very well; I might so lecture (to empty seats, of course); but my hearer (if, perchance, I should have one) would know that the word *Carex* is understood in every case. The group and the name of that group would be constantly in his mind. But if one were lecturing upon distribution of plants, morphology, or a dozen other botanical subjects, he would be obliged to use the generic name whenever he used a specific name, and both words—the combination—would appeal to every hearer as *the name*. It is a mere incident, it seems to me, whether the generic name is expressed or understood: in either case, both words are assumed as coordinate parts of the conception of a plant name.

I am sorry to be so obtuse and insistent. But I hope that Professor Greene will kindly help me still further out of my difficulty. The question which was propounded seems to me to be central to the whole nomenclatorial controversy. It seemed so five years ago, when I first ventured the proposition; but the fact that no one took up the issue seemed to show that my trouble was simply a personal perplexity and devoid of merit in itself.—L. H. BAILEY, *Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.*